



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,091	07/08/2003	Mark Davis	1070P3821	9656
53483	7590	03/02/2010		
KACVINSKY LLC 4500 BROOKTREE ROAD SUITE 102 WEXFORD, PA 15090			EXAMINER LEE, TING ZHOU	
			ART UNIT 2173	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 03/02/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

evergot@kacvinskyllaw.com
sbartl@kacvinskyllaw.com

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No. 10/616,091	Applicant(s) DAVIS, MARK
Examiner TING LEE	Art Unit 2173

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 25 January 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 6, 7, 9, 10, 16, 17, 19, 20, 27-31 and 37-41.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/TING LEE/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments have been fully considered, however, they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that Iwata does not make any reference to the dimensions of the display areas and that the small-display mode is not substantially square in shape. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The claims recite that the small display mode is "substantially" square in shape instead of "exactly square" and the specification of the instant application does not explicitly define what dimensions are considered be "substantially square". The difference between the width and height of the screen in Figure 32 of Iwata is only 0.7 inches. The examiner argues that since the specification does not quantify a threshold for what dimensions are considered to qualify as "substantially" square, the small difference of 0.7 inches qualifies as substantially square. Furthermore, Figure 3A-3B of the applicant's drawings shows an example of the transition from a small display mode 301 in Figure 3A to a tall display mode 301+302 in Figure 3B; the screen 301 in Figure 3A, representing the claimed small display mode that is substantially square in shape measures 0.75 inches tall and 2 inches wide. Therefore, since the applicant's drawings show that the small display mode does not need to be exactly square and that the 2:1 ratio of the width to height dimensions of the small display mode in Figure 3A qualifies as being substantially square in shape, the examiner respectfully argues that the ratio of the small display mode taught by Iwata is also substantially square. Furthermore, the transition from the small display size in Figure 3A to the tall display size of Figure 3B of the drawings in the instant application is similar to the transition in size of the display screen from Figure 1 to Figure 2 of Iwata. In view of the above, the examiner respectfully maintains that the rejections made in the final office dated 11/25/2009.